PRG

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/651,073 | 08/30/2000 | Reiner Kraft | ARC9-2000-0111-US1 | 2123 |

23334 7590 09/30/2003

FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS,
GUTMAN & BONGINI, P.L.
ONE BOCA COMMERCE CENTER
551 NORTHWEST 77TH STREET, SUITE 111
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| RONES, CHARLES |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2175 | 7 |

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/651,073 | Applicant(s) KRAFT ET AL. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Examiner Charles L. Rones | Art Unit 2175 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 July 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Amendment*

The amendment timely filed on July 28, 2003 has been entered.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 20 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Horowitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,987) in view of Singhal (U.S. Patent No. 6,163, 782).

As to claim 1, Horowitz et al. teaches a method for comparison of documents found on a network interconnected with a plurality of information processing units and hub processing units, the method on an information processing unit comprising the steps of:

receiving a user search request on a concept of interest to a user (see Fig. 2; see Abstract; also see column 9, lines 31-40);

returning search result items based upon the user search request (see column 7, lines 28-31); and

determining if a search engine is supported by a comparison system (see column 7, lines 3-20; also see column 21, line 66 through column 22, line 7).

As to hub processing units, the recitation "hub processing units" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone.

Howrowitz et al. discloses the claimed invention except for comparing content of at least two documents identified in the search results, wherein the comparison system returns a numeric similarity value, which represents the similarity of the documents. Singhal teaches that it is known to compare content of at least two documents identified in the search results, wherein the comparison system returns a numeric similarity value, which represents the similarity of the documents. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compare content of at least two documents identified in the search results, wherein the comparison system returns a numeric similarity value, which represents the similarity of the documents as taught by Singhal, since Singhal states at column 6, lines 48-67 and column 7, lines 1-11 that such a modification would only the documents most likely to be useful determined as a result of the system user's search query entered.

As to claim 20, Horowitz et al. teaches a computer readable program product for comparison of documents found on a network interconnected with a plurality of information processing units (see Abstract) and hub processing units, the computer readable program product comprising instructions for:

receiving a user selection request to select documents for comparison (see column 10, lines 37-41; where user selecting a topic is same as user selecting a set of documents); and

comparing documents for similarity (see column 7, lines 14-20).

As to claim 23, Horowitz et al. teaches a method for comparison of documents found on a network interconnected with a plurality of information processing units (see Abstract; see column 7, lines 15-20) and hub processing units, the method on a hub processing unit comprising the steps of:

receiving retrieved search result documents in a comparison unit (see column 22, lines 1-5; where "retrieved search result" is read on "documents of the document collection"); and

beginning comparison of the retrieved search result documents, wherein the comparison includes returning a numeric similarity value which represents the similarity of the documents (see column 22, lines 5-7; Singhal: column 6, 49-67 and column 7, line 1-11).

As to claim 24, Horowitz et al. teaches a method, further comprising the steps of:

forwarding the value to a GUI / Event Manager (see column 22, lines 13-20; where "forwarding the value to a GUI" is read on "providing to the user interface").

As to claim 25, Horowitz et al. teaches a method, wherein generating a graphic display of the similarity value for forwarding to the GUI / Event Manager (see Fig. 3; where "graphic display" is "venn diagram").

As to claim 26, Horowitz et al. teaches a method, wherein the display graphic comprises a Venn Diagram (see Fig. 3).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,987) in view of Singhal (U.S. Patent No. 6,163, 782), in further view of Goiffon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,312).

As to claim 2, Horowitz et al. teaches a method, wherein if the determining step determines that the search engine is supported by the comparison system, then:

parsing the search result items by a result set manager (see Fig. 1, element 150; see column 10, lines 20-29; also see column 7, lines 28-31; where "parsing" is read on "processing"); and

Horowitz et al. does not teach identifying any document identifiers the search result items and marking them by a result set manager.

Goiffon et al. teaches identifying any document identifiers the search result items and marking them by a result set manager (see column 15, lines 49-63; also see column 5, lines 45-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include identifying any document identifiers the search result items and marking them by a result set manager.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. by the teachings of Goiffon et al., because having a system capable of marking the search results, enables the user to locate and retrieve needed documents in a timely manner and also allows the user to identify the best or most relevant information associated with a user request (see Goiffon et al., see column 1, lines 46-50).

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,987) in view of Singhal (U.S. Patent No. 6,163, 782) in view of Goiffon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,312) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Baisley (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,112).

As to claim 3, Horowitz et al. as modified does not teach retrieving knowledge of a structure and content of the search result items by a result set manager from a database.

Baisley teaches retrieving knowledge of a structure and content of the search result items by a result set manager from a database (see column 1, lines 53-57; where "knowledge of a structure" is read on "structure" and "content of search result" is read on "element types used in a document").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. as modified to include retrieving knowledge of a structure and content of the search result items by a result set manager from a database.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. as modified by the teachings of Baisley, because it results in substantial time saving and further it makes it less tedious when large number of XML documents need to be processed (see Baisley, see column 2, lines 41-55).

As to claim 4, Horowitz et al. as modified does not teach passing marked search result items to a Graphical User Interface (GUI) / Event Manager.

Goiffon et al. teaches passing marked search result items to a Graphical User Interface(GUI) / Event Manager (see column 15, lines 41-67; where the process of

marking search results can be automated without user intervention as per column 5, lines 49-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. as modified to include passing marked search result items to a Graphical User Interface (GUI) / Event Manager.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. as modified by the teachings of Goiffon et al., because having a system capable of marking the search results, enables the user to locate and retrieve needed documents in a timely manner and also allows the user to identify the best or most relevant information associated with a user request (see Goiffon et al., see column 1, lines 46-50).

As to claim 5, Horowitz et al. as modified does not teach associating an event handler to each search result item by a GUI / Event Manager.

Goiffon et al. teaches associating an event handler to each search result item by a GUI / Event Manager (see Fig. 8; see column 17, lines 5 -16; where "event handler" is read on

"function").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include associating an event handler to each search result item by a GUI / Event Manager.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. by the teachings of Goiffon et al., because having a system capable of associating the search results with a word variant element, enables the user to locate and retrieve needed documents in a timely manner and also allows the user to identify the best or most relevant information associated with a user request (see Goiffon et al., see column 1, lines 46-50).

9. Claims 6-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,987) in view of Singhal (U.S. Patent No. 6,163, 782), in view of Goiffon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,312) and in view of Baisley (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,112) as applied to claims 2-5 above and further in view of Chu (U.S. Patent No. 6,427,146).

As to claim 6, Horowitz et al. as modified does not teach displaying an enhanced search result item set in a display by a GUI / Event Manager.

Chu teaches displaying an enhanced search result item set in a display by a GUI / Event Manager (see column 4, lines 60-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. as modified to include displaying an enhanced search result item set in a display by a GUI / Event Manager.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. as modified by the teachings of

Chu, because having a enhancement capability, helps in dealing with inexact and uncertain conditions in cases such as too many irrelevant documents (see Chu, see column 1, lines 51-57).

As to claim 7, Horowitz et al. as modified does not teach a method, wherein the display comprises a web browser.

Goiffon et al. teaches the display comprises a web browser (see Fig. 10, element 1008; see column 21, lines 33-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include the display comprises a web browser.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. by the teachings of Goiffon et al., because it enables the user to locate and retrieve needed documents in a timely manner and also allows the user to identify the best or most relevant information associated with a user request (see Goiffon et al., see column 1, lines 46-50).

As to claim 8, Horowitz et al. as modified teaches initiating a user selection process (see column 3, lines 25-27) and; and Receiving a user selection (see 3, lines 40-44; where "receiving" is read on "responsive to user selection").

Horowitz et al. as modified does not teach notifying an event handler.

Chu teaches initiating notifying an event handler (see column 1, line 66 through column 2, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include an event handler with notification feature.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. by the teachings of Chu, because by having an event handler with notification capability, enables easier rule specification and maintenance (see Chu, see column 8, lines 53-55).

As to claim 9, Horowitz et al. does not teach user selection request comprises a drag and drop mouse selection.

Chu teaches user selection request comprises a drag and drop mouse selection (see column 6, lines 32-49).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include user selection request comprises a drag and drop mouse selection.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. by the teachings of Chu, because by having a drag and drop feature, it enables easier rule specification and maintenance (see Chu, see column 8, lines 53-55).

As to claim 10, Horowitz et al. as modified teaches selected source and target search result items (see column 9, lines 31-62; where "target search results" is read on "document set 152").

Horowitz et al. as modified does not teach receiving a notification in the GUI/Event Handler.

Chu teaches a notification in the GUI/Event Handler (see column 1, line 66 through column 2, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include an event handler with notification feature.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. by the teachings of Chu, because by having an event handler with notification capability, enables easier rule specification and maintenance (see Chu, see column 8, lines 53-55).

As to claim 11, Horowitz et al. as modified teaches selected source and target search result items (see column 9, lines 31-62; where "target search results" is read on "document set 152").

Horowitz et al. as modified does not expressly teach a downloader component.

However, Horowitz et al. teaches processing a query by a remote system (see column 10, lines 42-46; "remote system" is read on "system on the internet").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include a downloader component.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al., because by having a downloader component, enables users a useful arrangement of retrieved documents and offers organizational benefits of navigation and querying in a topic hierarchy (see Horowitz et al., column 1, lines 30-32; also see column 2, lines 59-63).

As to claim 12, Horowitz et al. as modified teaches attempting to access and retrieve search result documents represented by the selected source and target search result items (see column 7, lines 28-34; also see column 10, lines 47-61; where "target search results" is read on "document set 152").

Horowitz et al. as modified does not expressly teach a downloader component.

However, Horowitz et al. teaches processing a query by a remote system (see column 10, lines 42-46; "remote system" is read on "system on the internet").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include a downloader component.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al., because by having a

downloader component, enables users a useful arrangement of retrieved documents and offers organizational benefits of navigation and querying in a topic hierarchy (see Horowitz et al., column 1, lines 30-32; also see column 2, lines 59-63).

As to claim 13, Horowitz et al. as modified does not expressly teach determining if retrieval is possible and if not possible then sending an error message to the GUI/Event Handler.

Chu teaches determining if retrieval is possible and if not possible then sending an error message to the GUI/Event Handler (see column 1, line 66 through column 2, line 5; The event manager generates a notification according to an action, so it is implicitly stated that the notification message can be of any form).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include determining if retrieval is possible and if not possible then sending an error message to the GUI/Event Handler.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. by the teachings of Chu, because by having an event handler with notification capability, enables easier rule specification and maintenance (see Chu, see column 8, lines 53-55).

As to claim 14, Horowitz et al. as modified teaches determining if retrieval is possible and if the retrieval is possible then retrieving search result documents

represented by the selected source and target search result items (see column 20, lines 1-48; "determining" is read on "evaluation of scores of topics"; The document content organization module decides if there are any documents in the result based upon the scoring given to each subtopic combination of perspective topic and the low scored documents are eliminated from result group).

Horowitz et al. as modified does not expressly teach a downloader component.

However, Horowitz et al. teaches processing a query by a remote system (see column 10, lines 42-46; "remote system" is read on "system on the internet").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include a downloader component.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al., because by having a downloader component, enables users a useful arrangement of retrieved documents and offers organizational benefits of navigation and querying in a topic hierarchy (see Horowitz et al., column 1, lines 30-32; also see column 2, lines 59-63).

Horowitz et al. as modified does not expressly teach forwarding the retrieved search result documents to a comparison unit.

However, Horowitz et al. as modified in an alternate embodiment teaches a comparison module for comparing documents for similarity (see column 7, lines 9-13; also see column 21, line 66 through column 22, line 7; where "comparison module" is read on "comparison function").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include a comparison module for comparing documents for similarity.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al., because having a comparison module allows the documents to be compared against documents in the documents set, thus offering the benefit of grouping together semantically related set of documents (see Horowitz et al., column 4, lines 56-59).

As to claim 15, Horowitz et al. as modified does not expressly teach receiving retrieved search result documents in a comparison unit; and beginning comparison of the retrieved search result documents.

However, Horowitz et al. as modified in an alternate embodiment teaches a comparison module for comparing documents for similarity (see column 7, lines 9-13; also see column 21, line 66 through column 22, line 7; where "comparison module" is read on "comparison function").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include a comparison module for comparing documents for similarity.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al., because having a comparison module allows the documents to be compared against documents in the documents set,

thus offering the benefit of grouping together semantically related set of documents (see Horowitz et al., column 4, lines 56-59).

As to claim 16, Horowitz et al. as modified teaches computing a similarity value for the retrieved search result documents; and forwarding the value to the GUI/Event Manager (see column 17, lines 24-37; where "similarity value" is read on "rating value").

As to claim 17, Horowitz et al. as modified teaches generating a display graphic of the similarity value (see column 11, lines 6-8; where "graphic display of the similarity value" is read on "Venn diagram").

As to claim 18, Horowitz et al. as modified teaches a method, wherein the display graphic comprises a Venn Diagram (see Fig. 3)

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,987) in view of Singhal (U.S. Patent No. 6,163, 782), view of Chu (U.S. Patent No. 6,427,146).

As to claim 21, Horowitz et al. does not teach user selection request comprises a drag and drop mouse selection.

Chu teaches user selection request comprises a drag and drop mouse selection (see column 6, lines 32-49).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include user selection request comprises a drag and drop mouse selection.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. by the teachings of Chu, because by having a drag and drop feature, it enables easier rule specification and maintenance (see Chu, see column 8, lines 53-55).

Claims 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,987) in view of Singhal (U.S. Patent No. 6,163, 782).

As to claim 19, Horowitz et al. teaches an information processing system for comparison of documents found on a network interconnected with a plurality of information processing units and hub processing units, the information processing system comprising

a selection module (150) for receiving a user selection request to select documents for comparison wherein the comparison includes returning a numeric similarity value which represents the similarity of the documents ( see column 4, lines 9-18; Singhal: column 6, lines 49-67 and column 7, lines 1-11).

Horowitz et al. does not expressly teach a comparison module for comparing documents for similarity.

However, Horowitz et al. in an alternate embodiment teaches a comparison module for comparing documents for similarity (see column 7, lines 9-13; also see column 21, line 66 through column 22, line 7; where "comparison module" is read on "comparison function").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include a comparison module for comparing documents for similarity.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al., because having a comparison module allows the documents to be compared against documents in the documents set, thus offering the benefit of grouping together semantically related set of documents (see Horowitz et al., column 4, lines 56-59).

As to claim 22, Horowitz et al. does not expressly teach instruction of computing a similarity percentage for the selected documents.

However, Horowitz et al. in an alternate embodiment teaches instruction of computing a similarity percentage for the selected documents (see column 22, lines 5-7; where "similarity percentage" is read on "percentage of matches").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al. to include computing a similarity percentage for the selected documents.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Horowitz et al., because having a comparison module allows the documents to be compared against documents in the documents set, thus offering the benefit of grouping together sematically related set of documents (see Horowitz et al., column 4, lines 56-59).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 een considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles L. Rones whose telephone number is (703-306-3030. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays – Fridays from Monday-Thursday 8am-4pm pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached on (703-305-3830. The fax numbers of the group is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Charles Rones

Charles L. Rones
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2175

September 23, 2003